SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY MONMOUTH COUNTY HEARD VIA ZOOM LAW DIVISION, CIVIL PART DOCKET NO. MON-L-2483-15

IN THE MATTER OF THE)
APPLICATION OF THE BOROUGH)
OF RUMSON.)
X----X

TRANSCRIPT
OF
COMPLIANCE HEARING

Place: Monmouth County Courthouse

71 Monmouth Park Freehold, N.J. 07728

Heard via Zoom

Date: May 20, 2021

BEFORE:

THE HONORABLE LINDA GRASSO JONES, J.S.C.

TRANSCRIPT ORDERED BY:

REBECCA WINSTON (Surenian, Edwards & Nolan, LLC)

APPEARANCES:

ERIK NOLAN, ESQUIRE (Jeffrey R. Surenian And Associates, LLC) Attorney for The Borough of Rumson.

CRAIG M. GIANETTI, ESQUIRE (Day, Pitney, LLP)
Attorney for Yellow Brook Property Co., LLC.

Transcriber:

Geraldine Famularo
19 Cherrywood Circle
Brick, New Jersey 08724
(732) 458-8298

Sound Recorded By Peter Beauharnals

APPEARANCES:

WITNESS

Kendra Lelie

BASSAM GERGI, ESQUIRE (Fair Share Housing Center) Attorneys for Fair Share Housing Center.

STEVEN FIRKSER, ESQUIRE (Greenbaum, Rowe, Smith & Davis LLP) Attorneys for Stuart Sendell.

FRANCIS BANISCH, III, PP/AICP. Court Appointed Special Master.

3

I N D E X

Direct

Cross

By Mr. Nolan By Mr. Gergi Frank Banisch		16	25	
By The Court		31		
EXHIBIT P-16	Conditional Judgment of	Compliance	e and	<u>Evid.</u> 28
P-17 P-18	Repose Order, 2/24/21 Borough Letter, 4/19/21 Nolan Certification and	Evhibita	/ /1 Q /21	28 28
P-19 P-20	Levin Certification and Nolan Certification and	Exhibits,	4/19/21	28 28
P-21 P-22	Borough Letter, 5/17/21 Levin Certification and	·		28 28
P-23 P-24	Court Master Report, 5/2 Consent Order	•	3/17/21	28 18
RULING By The Court39				

(The matter was called at 9:01 a.m.)

THE COURT: It is 9:01. This is In The Matter of The Borough of Rumson, County of Monmouth, Docket number MON-L-2483-15. This is the continuation of the Compliance Hearing for the Borough of Rumson, a Declaratory Judgment action filed by Rumson. The Court held a Fairness Hearing in this matter on July 29th, 2020. We began day one of the Compliance Hearing. There was a number of outstanding issues, if I recall, and we scheduled the conclusion of the Compliance Hearing for today, May 20th, 2021.

My understanding from the documentation that I received — correspondence that I recently received is that outstanding matters have been resolved. What I'm going to do is my Court Clerk tells me that you can hear us and that we are on the record. He sent me a little message. What I'm going to do is allow everyone to enter their appearance. I am going to ask counsel for Rumson to let me know where we are at this point in time in terms of public notice of this hearing and also I'm potentially going to take testimony from individuals. Any individuals providing testimony will be sworn in.

There may be members of the public who have joined in. I know for the Fairness Hearing we had a

large number of members of the public who wanted to be heard and we did, in fact, hear from them. Obviously, we're doing this via Zoom as we've pretty much everything via Zoom in the last fifteen months right now, fourteen months. If members of the public want to be heard on this, you absolutely will have the opportunity to do so. The order of things is I'm going to have everyone enter their appearance. That means the attorneys who are representing individuals or members of the public, you can now hang out, watch, and listen. I would ask for anyone who is not speaking that you mute yourself whether it's a member of the public or actually an attorney because -- I'm in the Courthouse right now sitting in my chambers. If I were home, I would have a dog barking in the background which is pretty much my way of life these days when I'm working from home, and if everyone else has a dog barking in the background it's going to be a pretty loud hearing without having any ability to hear what people have to say. So I'd ask that everyone mute themselves.

When we do the appearances we're going to be hearing from counsel from Rumson; we're going to be hearing any testimony on behalf of Rumson; we're going to hear from the attorney for Fair Share Housing Center. All the attorneys in this case will have the

opportunity to cross-examine individuals. So if Rumson has a witness testifying, then the other attorneys will have the opportunity to ask questions of that witness. If any members of the public have a question for a witness, let me know and you can ask the witness questions.

I'm going to be able to hear from Fair Share Housing Center. Even though they don't have a witness, basically Fair Share Housing Center's attorney, will you know, will put Fair Share Housing Center's position on the record. I know we have counsel here for the developer involved in the matter. After I've heard from the attorneys on these things, I'll hear from members of the public if they want to be heard.

What I do need at that point normally I have a second person helping with the management, and a second person, my Law Clerk. She is not in today. So, Mike, what I'm going to ask is when we get to the point after we've heard from the witnesses for the Borough but before we hear from Mr. Banisch, if there's any members of the public who want to be heard, I'm going to ask individuals, I'm going to tell you this is your chance to be heard. You're going to unmute yourself. There may be a couple of you talking at once and we'll keep track of who it is that wants to be heard, who

-

wants to say something, and basically you'll have your opportunity to do that one at a time.

So, Mike -- I'm speaking now to my Court Clerk Mike and telling him he's going to have to sort of be keeping track of that, as well.

So when I say, "Okay, this is the chance for members of the public to be heard on this," that would be your opportunity to unmute yourself, you're going to tell me your name — there might be a couple of you talking at once. We'll sort it out, we'll get to you one by one, and you will have your opportunity to speak and let us know what your thoughts, or happiness, or concerns are, or if you have any questions for anyone who has testified as a witness in this case, we can address it at that point in time.

After that usually the last person I hear from is Mr. Banisch, who is the Special Master appointed by the Court, and we'll hear from Mr. Banisch with reference to everything that has gone on since the last Compliance Hearing date. My understanding is I've taken a look at what's been submitted and I do have a proposed form of Order that has to be submitted to me. So anyone is involved in the case can let me know, yes, that you want me to sign it, or not sign it. And after that I will render a decision on the record with

reference to the Compliance Hearing aspect.

For individuals who have not been part of this overall process and saying, you know, what is this all about, I'll tell you Rumson in 2015 -- the New Jersey Supreme Court had rendered a decision. It's found that 2:21 New Jersey 1 which is called Mount Laurel IV. Basically what the decision says is that COAH did not seem to be able to sort of pull it together -- COAH, the Council on Affordable Housing -did not seem to be able to get it together to make sure that Affordable Housing would happen in the State of New Jersey from a management perspective and basically turned the matters back over to the Court, and counsel were given the opportunity to file Declaratory Judgment actions saying, "We want to take care of this. We don't need anyone suing us, telling us what to do. We can take care of this. We're going to put together a plan and to make sure that an opportunity is presented within our town for the development of Affordable Housing." And that is what Rumson did, in fact, filed and has a 2015 docket number.

I know that Rumson and the developer parties worked very hard and I mentioned that with reference at the Fairness Hearing, worked very hard to reach an agreement that was acceptable to all parties. The Court

had the Compliance Hearing, as I indicated. The Order was signed at the Fairness Hearing on July 29th, 2020. The Fairness Hearing was held over a period of multiple dates that allowed members of the public who sent in letters — there may have been seventy people may have even spoke at the Fairness Hearings, and the Court entered an Order approving the Settlement on July 29th, 2020.

So this is what we call the last leg of the journey. This is the Compliance Hearing. The purpose of this is for the Court to receive information indicating that the things that the Court said in the prior Order needed to be done, the Borough is letting the Court know, in fact, it has done the things that it needs to do.

So what I'm going to do is ask for the attorneys who are making an appearance in this case, I'm asking you all to enter your appearance in the case. For the individual members of the public, you don't need to speak at this point in time. At this point in time you're absolutely welcomed to be here. You can hang out. We will get to you, as I indicated, a little bit later in the proceeding.

So, Counsel, would you like to begin? MR. NOLAN: Erik Nolan, Your Honor, on behalf

of the Borough of Rumson. Good morning.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. GERGI: Good morning, Judge. This is Bassam Gergi, counsel for Fair Share Housing Center.

MR. FIRKSER: Good morning, Your Honor. Steven Firkser from Greenbaum, Rowe, Smith & Davis, attorney for interested party Stuart Sendell.

MR. GIANETTI: Good morning, Your Honor. Craig Gianetti of the law firm of Day, Pitney on behalf of Yellow Brook Property, intervener defendant.

THE COURT: And is there anyone else?
Okay. And we also have Mr. Banisch, Frank
Banisch, who is present being the Court's Special
Master --

MR. BANISCH: Good morning, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Good morning -- who is the planner who provides information to the Court and also assists in mediating differences between the parties to see if the parties can reach an agreed upon resolution on any outstanding issues.

Mr. Nolan, would you like to proceed?

MR. NOLAN: I'll go through -- you went
through some of the procedural history quickly to
bring us up to where we've reached our Compliance
Hearing where we are. I can talk about the satisfaction

of the conditions.

So going back in time, as you stated earlier, you know, we had a Court decision in 2015. We entered into a Settlement with Fair Share Housing Center in January of 2020. So the Borough's DJ action globally and we also reached a Settlement with the developer Yellow Brook intervener during that same month. A properly notice Fairness Hearing was held on June 15th, June 22nd, July 9th, July 15th, and July 20th of 2020 during which testimony was presented, exhibits were marked into evidence. The Court approved also an agreement as between the Borough and Fair Share Housing Center, and the Borough and Yellow Brook. The Court entered an Order on July 29th, 2020 which memorialized the decision from the Fairness Hearing. The Borough and Fair Share Housing Center entered an amendment of the Fair Share Housing Center Settlement Agreement in the late fall of 2020 to implement the Settlement with Fair Share Housing Center as amended. The Housing Element and Fair Share Plan was adopted by the Borough's Planning Board on December 7th, 2020 and endorsed by the Borough Council on December 15th, 2020.

A properly noticed Compliance Hearing, the first part of the Compliance Hearing was held on February 9th, 2021 to include the Borough's Housing and

Fair Share Plan. Testimony was given by the Borough's planner Kendra Lelie. Comments from counsel and objectors were entertained by the Court. The Court entered a conditional settlement of Compliance on February 24th, 2021 which included Paragraph 9 showing current conditions that needed to be satisfied by the Borough and the Court Master discovery date 2021 report. Paragraph 9 required the Borough to submit a status update report regarding the satisfaction of the conditions by April 19th to the Court. The Court Master sent it off to the parties.

In Paragraph 11 of the JOR set a date of today to proceed (indiscernible) whether or not the Borough had satisfied those conditions. The Borough submitted the required status update report April 19th, 2021 which included a letter, supporting certifications that I handed in, and Dan Levin was the first (indiscernible) to grant planning and housing which is the Borough's administrative agent, and (indiscernible) Compliance Hearing we've also provided a second round of public notice to (indiscernible) papers and direct notice of the Borough's service list, and also posted the JOR which ordered a schedule hearing on the Borough's website.

On May 10th, 2021 Fair Share Housing Center

filed what a letter of comment and the Borough submitted (indiscernible) on behalf of (indiscernible) -- to Mr. Sendell. Mr. Levin also filed a spreadsheet regarding the (indiscernible) May 10th, 2021.

On May 17th, 2021 the Borough filed a second letter that provided a second certification of the administrative agent Mr. Levin and Mr. Levin's additional information.

On May 18th, 2021 the Borough sent a letter and exhibits that will be marked into evidence on behalf of the Borough during today's Compliance Hearing.

On May 19th, 2021 Bassam Gergi on behalf of Fair Share Housing Center (indiscernible) Mr. Sendell, myself and the Court Master all signed the Consent Order that discussed and addressed the objections that were raised by Mr. Sendell, and hopefully puts those to bed.

On May 20th, this morning the Court Master issued his follow-up report.

At this point I will list the exhibits that we want to mark into evidence on a continuing nature where we left off at the first date of the Compliance Hearing.

So exhibit P-16 is the conditional Judgment

of Compliance and Repose Order that was entered by the Court February 24th, 2021.

Exhibit P-17 is April 19th, 2021 is April 19th, 2021 short term condition satisfaction letter that I submitted to the Court.

 $$\operatorname{Exhibit}$$ P-18 is the April 19th certification with attached exhibits that I submitted to the Court.

 $$\rm P\text{--}19$ is the April 19th, 2021 certification of Dan Levin with attached exhibits.

Exhibit P-20 is the notice certification of that I did on May 11th, 2021 which shows that proper public notice and service list was done for this second day of the hearing.

Exhibit P-21 is the May 17th, 2021 letter I submitted responding to the objection letters.

Exhibit P-22 is the May 17th, 2021 supplemental certification of Dan Levin submitted with attached exhibits.

I think we should mark the Court Master's report as Exhibit P-23, May 20th, which was just submitted to the Court this morning.

And then we have a Consent Order, Your Honor. So I don't know if that would be exhibit P-24. We'd make that the final exhibit.

THE COURT: (indiscernible) be a Consent

Order. I will certainly hear if someone objects to it, but I wouldn't exactly expect that I'm going to get vehement objections from anyone except perhaps, you know, one of the members of the public. So we will mark the Consent Order as P-24.

MR. NOLAN: That's it as far as the exhibits go, Your Honor. At this point I'm going to call Kendra Lelie with regard to the Borough's planner to testify.

THE COURT: Okay. Is it Lilly or Lelie? I want to make sure -- I have a feeling that I've probably mispronounced Mr. Gergi's name a whole lot. (Chuckle) He's always very pleasant to not tell me. So when he starts talking today, he can remind me of that.

KENDRA LELIE, THE BOROUGH'S WITNESS, SWORN THE COURT: Please state your name, spelling your last name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Kendra, Lelie, L-E-L-I-E.

THE COURT: Counsel, I know that Ms. Lelie's qualifications have previously been set forth on the record in this matter. I do find as I have found before that she is an expert in the area of planning specifically with reference to Affordable Housing. You're welcomed to put as much or little on the record with reference to her qualifications since this is a continuation of prior hearings and I have previously

found that she's an expert.

Has anything happened, you haven't lost your license between last time you testified and now; have you, Ms. Lelie?

THE WITNESS: No. No, Your Honor, my license is still active and in good standing.

THE COURT: Okay. So that basically that satisfies she's still an expert in the area that I've previously said she's an expert in. But like I said, you're welcomed to address it or not address. I find that she's an expert.

MR. NOLAN: If Your Honor is satisfied that she's an expert, then I won't have to do that and we can go right into her testimony.
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. NOLAN:

- Q Ms. Lelie, during the first date of the Compliance Hearing on February 9th, 2021 you testified about the Borough adopted the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan. It was marked into evidence as P-1. Although they're not attached (indiscernible) for the time period of the Borough's Plan B, (indiscernible) is that correct? A Yes.
- Q And the Court held that subject to the satisfaction of the (indiscernible) conditions in D,

the Court Master (indiscernible) report which was marked into as P-15, the Borough's Housing Element and Fair Share Plan did create a realistic opportunity for the production of Affordable Housing and (indiscernible) conditionally approve that plan; is that correct?

A That's correct.

- Q And the Court also entered a conditional Judgment of Compliance and Repose Order on February 24th, 2021 which has been marked into evidence today as P-16; is that correct?
- A Yes.
 - Q And you've reviewed the JOR?
- A I have.
- Q And Paragraph 9 of the JOR Order established conditions being the Court's Master's position in (indiscernible) of the report for the Borough to address; right?
- A Yes.
- Q Paragraph 9 set a deadline of April 19th, 2021 for the Borough to submit a report with supporting documentation to Court, the Court Master, Fair Share Housing Center, and all interested parties regarding the satisfaction of those conditions; correct?
 A It did.

Q And the Borough submitted a status updated report along with supporting certifications of additional documentation in 2021?

A Yes, they have.

Q And the Borough also submitted supplemental certifications on May 17th; correct?

A Yes.

 $\ensuremath{\mathtt{Q}}$ $\ensuremath{\mathtt{A}}$ And you reviewed and are familiar with all these documents?

A I am.

Q Let's discuss satisfaction of conditions in Paragraph 9 of the JOR that involved affordable units in the Borough will create will satisfy the (indiscernible)

A Yes.

Q As is required in conditions 9E, 9F, 9G, and 9H the Borough (indiscernible) BCUW to construct Affordable Housing project on 62 Carton Street, 6 Maplewood Avenue, 15 Maplewood Avenue, and 61 South Ward Street; is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q The April 13th, 2021 agreement between BCUW and the Borough which was attached to my certification was marked into evidence as exhibit P-18 today; is that correct?

A Yes.

 ${\tt Q}\,$ And did you help us negotiate that BCUW agreement?

A I did.

Q And a few changes were made to the proposed BCUW project since the February 9th, 2021 Compliance Hearing; is that right?

A That's correct.

Q And can you go through those changes that were made on a project by project basis?

A Sure. So while the overall number of Affordable Housing units has not changed, there were some changes with regard to bedrooms and various income distributions amongst the units. BCUW is going to be managing the building. We worked with Fair Share Housing on the agreement before we finalized it to make sure that the agreement complied with the Settlement Agreement. I can go through the individual projects that have changed that the BCUW will again build and manage.

So the first is 62 Carton Street. This is also known as the hundred percent site. That will be part and parcel of the Yellow Brook development. This project will consist of ten affordable family non-age restricted rental units and six affordable special

needs bedroom units. Eight of the ten family units will be two bedrooms and at least three of those two-bedrooms will be low income and one of those two-bedroom will be very low income. The remaining four two-bedroom units will look like maybe moderate income and two of the ten Affordable Housing units of the remaining ten -- I'm sorry -- two will be one-bedroom units, and one of those units will be a low income unit and the other will be moderate income unit. There will also six, as I said, six special needs bedrooms which will look like they'll all be very low income units. So that's -- it's a slight change to 62 Carton Street. The project at golf will be built and be open to present Affordable Housing managed by BCUW.

The second project known as 15 Maplewood -- this

The second project known as 15 Maplewood — this is actually one lot which will be subdivided into two lots. The first lot will have a family non-age restricted rental unit, and that will be renovated existing home. On the other lot a new building will be built that will support or house four affordable supportive special needs bedrooms. The affordable family rental unit will be a three-bedroom. That's an existing two-bedroom house and it will be a moderate income unit, and the deed restriction will specify that the 15 Maplewood project will also be restricted for

the special needs residents. Again, most likely, all very low income units. That, I don't believe has changed drastically. The income distribution changed a bit from the original testimony that we had.

61 South Ward project is the third project that BCUW will be in charge of and constructing and/or renovating. This will be a two -- right now it's an existing home on 61 South Ward. And the way that the Settlement Agreement and the developers agreement is worded is that there's a chance that it either will be renovated in kind, meaning that the building will stay and there will be internal renovations and potentially an addition, or the option is to also tear down and build new is provided. And that really has everything to do with whether State funding is available for the construction of a new home. So (indiscernible) pro forma. We've looked at the funding source from the State to help with the construction of a new building on that site. If that does not come to fruition we would probably have to take a look at the funding source -- obviously, the Borough has adopted an Ordinance to cover any shortage of the hundred percent project, but the decision as to whether it will be rebuilt or renovated, that really has everything to do with State funding. So the composition of the 61 South

Ward project would be two family rental units. They would both be three bedrooms and they would both be very low. They've entered into a Settlement Agreement between the Borough and Fair Share, and the Borough adopted an Housing Element and Fair Share Plan both require these units are rental units and not for sale units. It's very important to understand that we do not have the ability to change that for sale unit because of what I call micro requirements that are in the agreement with Fair Share Housing that a certain number of units must be rental, family rental units.

And then the last project that BCUW is 6 Maplewood Avenue. This is an existing house that will get some minor renovations. This will be a for sale unit and it will be a multi-bedroom moderate income unit.

- Q Now that you've discussed the changes made to the various projects and the requirement that the (indiscernible) stream hasn't entered into a BCUW project, let's discuss the remaining.

 A Okay.
- Q Did the BCUW put together a pro forma as is required by positions 9E, 9F, 9G, 9H of the Order? A They did.
- Q And the finances for each of these projects is broken in the pro forma; is that correct?

A Yes, that is correct.

Q What about the construction schedule? A They all have particular construction schedules which is the requirement of a hundred percent job, project, and they are separate construction schedules for each of the projects (indiscernible) previously. That's part, I believe, of exhibit P-18, and all the end dates for the completion of each of the different locations, different projects, line up with the amendment to the Settlement Agreement with Fair Share Housing. So the conditions requiring a production of a construction schedule as well as the pro forma have been satisfied.

- Q So in your opinion the production of documents attached to the two certifications are conditions 9E, 9F, 9G, and 9H are satisfied?
 A Yes.
- Q Let's go to the existing (indiscernible) credit for five existing affordable units in the Borough; is that correct?

A That's correct. Quickly, I'll go through those units that are occupied today. 19 North Street, this is a constructed occupied. This is a low income family for sale unit.

68 Black Point Road, again this is an existing

occupied low income family for sale unit.

16B Washington Street, this is also a constructed occupied for low income family rental unit.

And then 7 Lafayette Street, I think there are two units; Unit A is a moderate income unit; Unit B would be a low income unit.

- $\,$ Q $\,$ And has the Borough satisfied all the conditions in the February 21st, 2021 Order for existing affordable units? A $\,$ They have.
- Q And GMR already found that the unit at 68 Black Point Road was (indiscernible); is that correct? A That's correct.
- Q And the Borough worked with its administrative agent to provide documentation for submissions that showed that the 19 North Street affordable units and 16 Washington Street affordable units have the two affordable units located on 7 Lafayette Street are (indiscernible) is included putting deed restrictions in all units; is that correct?

 A Yes.
- Q So based on your experience as a Mount Laurel planner and your knowledge of COAH regulations included in two certifications provided, do you believe that all the projects listed are credit worthy that the Borough

should receive five credits for the existing units towards the satisfaction of (indiscernible)?

A Yes, I believe all five existing units are credit worthy based upon my review of the documents and experience as a planner and a Court Master.

- Q Were you able to read the Court Master's report that was filed today?
- A I did, yes.
- ${\tt Q}\,{\tt Do}$ you agree with the Court Master's recommendations?
- A Yes, I do.

MR. NOLAN: I have no further questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Gergi, do you have any questions for Ms. Lelie?

MR. GERGI: Thank you, just two very quick questions.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GERGI:

- Q Good morning, Ms. Lelie.
- A Good morning, Mr. Gergi.
- Q In your testimony a minute ago you noted that as part of the hundred percent affordable development the Borough has submitted a construction schedule and a developers agreement with BCUW; correct?

 A Yes.

- Q In the construction schedule and the developers agreement were there certain deadlines for the start and completion of the hundred percent affordable projects?
- A There are, yes.
- Q And is it your understanding that those deadlines match what was in the first amendment in the prior Settlement Agreement with Fair Share Housing Center and the Borough of Rumson?
- A Yes. To my knowledge, I believe that the construction schedules match with the Fair Share Housing Settlement Agreement.
- Q Thank you. And then in terms of the existing affordable units, have you reviewed the Consent Order that was signed by the Borough, counsel for Mr. Sendell, Fair Share Housing Center, and the Special Master yesterday?
- A I did.
- Q And to your knowledge, that Consent Order would extend or continue the controls on units 9A and 9B (indiscernible) for thirty years after the current occupants departed; is that your understanding?

 A That is my understanding.
- Q And do you have any concerns about that Consent Order or do you have any concerns

(indiscernible) producing the (indiscernible)? A I have no concerns.

Q Thank you. And then the last question, Ms. Lelie, in the Settlement Agreement, the January, 2020 Settlement Agreement between Fair Share and Rumson there was reference to 142 Bingham Avenue and the realistic development potential. Are you aware of that site and what the agreement states?

A I am.

Q And to your knowledge, does the agreement require the Borough within sixteen months of an Order of fairness to show that the site was owned, leased, or licensed in any manner operated by a County, Municipality, or non-profit pursuant to N.J.A.C. 5:93-4.2?

- A Yes, that's my understanding.
- Q And so the deadline, you know, for the Borough to show that it's been restricted for some sort of open space would be the end of November, 2021; is that your understanding?
- A That's correct.
- Q Okay. And would the Borough, to your knowledge, have any concern with that being one of the ongoing conditions in a Final Judgment?

 A Not at all.

Thank you very much, Ms. Lelie. MR. GERGI: Your Honor, no further questions from Fair Share Housing Center. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. Mr. Gianetti, do you have any questions for Ms. Lelie? MR. GIANETTI: No questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Firkser, technically your client is not a party to this, but you're hanging out with us. So it would be fair to ask you, do you have any questions of Ms. Lelie? MR. FIRKSER: Thank you. Thank you for allowing us to participate. No questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Nolan, do you have any follow-up that you need to ask Ms. Lelie? MR. NOLAN: No follow-up, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. And by the way, the additional documents that have been marked as P-16through P-24; does anyone have any objection to those documents being moved into evidence? UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: No objection. UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: Nothing. THE COURT: Okay. P-16 through P-24 are in evidence. I didn't cover that before.

THE COURT: Mr. Nolan, do you have any other witnesses or any other evidence that you want to present?

(P-16 through P-24 in evidence.)

MR. NOLAN: We were originally going to call Dan Levin, but because of the Consent Order, I don't think it's necessary to go into all the details as Ms. Lelie has already covered it. So we are not going to call any further witnesses.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, Mr. Nolan.
Mr. Gergi, do you have any witnesses you'd
like to call or anything you'd like to address?
MR. GERGI: No, Your Honor, no witnesses. The
Borough did a great job. So there's no further
comments.

THE COURT: Mr. Gianetti? Unmute yourself. MR. GIANETTI: Sorry. Nothing further, Your

Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. And, Mr. Firkser, I know that your client had great concern with reference to certain aspects of the Settlement that was reached. My understanding is that the concerns (indiscernible) through a regular participant and (indiscernible) My understanding is a Consent Order has been submitted which includes exhibits which address the concern that your client had raised, but it doesn't preclude you

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22 23

24

25

from speaking or participating. Is there anything that you'd like to add to the proceeding?

MR. FIRKSER: No, thank you, Your Honor. Our concerns have been addressed through the Consent Order. We would request the Court to enter it, and that addresses the remaining concerns Mr. Sendell had. Thank you.

THE COURT: So at this point in time I think I've heard everything that I'm going to hear from the participants in the case which would be the Borough of Rumson, Fair Share Housing Center, and Yellow Brook which is the developer. I haven't heard yet from Mr. Banisch. As I indicated before, I intended to basically open this up to members of the public and give members of the public the opportunity to be heard. So I note that there's 22 participants. Some of them are doubled up right now because Mr. Banisch is on the screen and I have his telephone and there are a couple other people participating.

With reference to members of the public, what I'm going to ask at this point in time is do you, if you want to be heard, basically if you want to say something with reference to this whether it's positive or negative, I'm going to ask you to unmute yourself. I think you can do that.

31

Mike, send me a message if they can't unmute themselves, but I think they can unmute themselves. If they can't, Mike, you need to unmute everyone.

But before unmuting yourself, wave at me -if you have the video and you can't unmute yourself. What I would like is if someone wants to be heard, this is your opportunity to do so.

(After a pause)

THE COURT: Mike tells me that you can unmute yourselves. So is there anyone from the members of the public who would like to be heard with reference to this proceeding?

(After a pause)

THE COURT: Okay. No one is responding. So that sounds to me that everyone wanted to step in and hear what was going on but they did not want to address the Court.

At this point in time what I'd like to do turn to Mr. Banisch, the Special Master. We'll swear Mr. Banisch in and he can tell me where we are at in terms of this final leg of the journey. F R A N C I S $\,$ B A N I S C H, THE COURT SPECIAL

MASTER, SWORN

THE COURT: Please state your name, spelling your last name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Francis J. Banisch, B-A-N-I-S-C-H.

THE COURT: And as Ms. Lelie, Mr. Banisch testified in day one of the Compliance Hearing and provided his qualifications at that point in time, and I did find that he's expert professional planner, he's an expert in the area of Affordable Housing. So I'm going to continue my findings that he is an expert in that area. My intention isn't to ask him any further questions with reference to his expertise in this area.

So, Mr. Banisch, I know you've been working very hard up until yesterday in terms of resolving the outstanding differences between the parties in this matter. I got a letter from you, your report indicating — that report has been marked as an exhibit, as it always is, as P-23. Would you like to tell me for purposes of the record where are the parties as of today. At the Compliance Hearing there were certain things that were supposed to be addressed by the Borough prior to a final Judgment of Compliance being entered. How has the Borough done?

THE WITNESS: The Borough -- I really have to report that the Borough has done exceptionally well considering what it took for us to get here over some of the bumps in the road. I think you might have given

me more credit than I deserve with regard to some late breaking developments that made this application clean and clear in terms of its meritoriousness. My work essentially mimics what we've heard from Ms. Lelie and, in fact, finds that every one of those items in paragraph 9 of the conditional JOR has been fully satisfied. The provisions required in the conditional JOR being fully satisfied.

We only need at this point to address one item which came to us by way of comments that Your Honor permitted into the record from Rabbi Harry Levin. He lives at 62 Ward Avenue. He wrote to you on May 6th of this year and he expressed concerns about the project at 61 South Ward. Generally speaking, because his letter — it's about ten pages and covered a variety of subjects with regard to this specific project — he expressed a desire to see the building currently existing to be razed and replaced with a new building. I think you heard Ms. Lelie say that that's one of the options of repairing and rebuilding the building that's on the site now. It's also option, and the final choice has not yet been made.

To the extent that the comments don't relate to whether or not the agreement is fair or to whether or not the town is entitled to a Judgment of

Compliance, there are no signs that there's something flawed in the proposed Compliance Judgment of this Court. I respectfully acknowledge the comments that he's made on the record, but I don't find that they rise to the level that applies to (indiscernible) as I recommended in my summary. I acknowledge that all the conditions of the conditional JOR are satisfied and it's appropriate to enter a Final Judgment.

I hope that the record in summary by me not repeating everything we heard from Ms. Lelie. She did a very thorough job on all parts, and I'm basically confirming that what she said is all true.

THE COURT: All right. Now, on oral argument on motions I usually tell attorneys, you know, I've got briefing and I tell them, "Please don't read to your brief to me because I got your brief and I read it." So I'm fine with not, you know, repeating something or reading something into the record for the purpose of reading it. It's one of the reasons that we mark the report that we get from the Special Master into evidence because then it's part of the record. And I did have an opportunity to review it, as did all of the attorneys and participants in this case.

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, one thing. Just for the record, I'd like to apologize to everybody for the

late arrival of that report. Ordinarily I would do it a lot better than the day of the hearing. I think the late breaking developments that made this a cleaner case -- and I thank Mr. Gergi for taking the labor of pulling all that together -- but I'll use that as my excuse for this one. I'll try and make sure you never have to see all of these the same day.

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Banisch, I would much rather get a later report that says --

THE WITNESS: (indiscernible - simultaneous speech)

THE COURT: -- than a report a week ago that says, "Boy, do we have problems." It's one of the reasons that I schedule conferences in certain types of cases, schedule regular conferences, is -- and it's sort of a range of that having an upcoming conference or hear a Compliance Hearing date really makes everyone pause. So, you know, you might look and say, well, why is it that everything is being discussed the day before or two days before? It's the nature of things. That is, knowing that you're coming in today and do you want a proceeding today that's not agreed to or everyone is fighting, or do you want, you know, a proceeding where the different parties have reached an agreement? You

know, what I would really want is that you've reached

an agreement, and sometimes it happens later than you'd like. So I have no problem with timing on it because I know what the parties were doing is working on reaching an agreement as opposed to presenting a contested issue. When I used to sit in Family, I used to say to people, "You really want me to decide when you get to see your kids?" And the thing, you know, with Mount Laurel is that do you really want me to decide these issues as opposed to you guys reaching an agreement? And usually reaching an agreement is what works.

Mr. Nolan, do you have any questions of Mr.

Banisch?

MR. NOLAN: I have no questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Gergi, do you have any

questions of Mr. Banisch?

MR. GERGI: No, Judge. Just to thank him for his time in helping us get to this point.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Gianetti, any questions? MR. GIANETTI: No questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Firkser, any questions? MR. FIRKSER: No questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I did receive a letter dated May 5th from Rabbi Harry Levin. He lives at 62 South Ward Avenue which is next to the 61 South Ward Avenue site. I note that Rabbi Levin does cover a variety of

issues in his letter. He expressed his concern, evidently there was a prior occupation of 61 South Ward that he felt goes against the neighborhood community feeling. He expressed a concern that he felt the town wasn't really working with him and with other individuals who lived around the property, around the neighborhood. He indicated that what he'd really like to see is that 61 South Ward be developed as an affordable housing that's purchased rather than rented. He indicated he wanted to see it torn down and something new built rather than renovated.

Neither one of those issues is something that for me I would be able to not enter a Judgment of Compliance on, and there are a couple reasons. Number one, the issue of renovation versus new development, I think as Ms. Lelie indicated, might come down to a matter funding, but nothing is going to be built there and occupied that doesn't meet construction and development requirements. So whether it is renovated or built brand new in no way will -- and I don't mean to suggest that the Borough is trying to build substandard -- in no way would the Borough be able to use that as Affordable Housing if it were not, in fact, acceptable housing. So it's not for me to say whether it should be new construction, tearing down and new construction, or

renovated construction.

In terms of rental property versus purchased, there is -- the Borough worked very closely with Fair Share Housing Center to determine the appropriate mix of rental versus purchased owned property. I know that there's a substantial benefit to rental properties which is our Courts -- it's difficult for low and moderate income, certainly very low income households to afford to buy a house or to buy a condo. Coming up with a down payment is extremely difficult and having -- the town worked very closely with Fair Share Housing Center and any other participants to come up with an appropriate mix. Rental properties are favored under the Affordable Housing context because that provides a very real opportunity for households to move into town, for households to live in Affordable Housing. So I certainly would not be in a position to require that the units be purchased as opposed to be rentals.

So I do appreciate the input from Rabbi Levin through the information that has been provided and I'm sorry he feels that the town has not been working with him. I will say since I've been involved in this case what has happened has been a process and when he's meeting with town officials he may be expressing a thought or concern on his part although the town may

not be able to tell him what he wants to hear. But, number one, the town may not at that point in time have been a position to give him any assurances one way or another because the town really doesn't know what it's doing until an agreement is reached.

And I think there was one other individual who was allowed into the proceeding by my Court Clerk when I asked the members of the public, "Did you want to be heard?" No? Hearing nothing.

Is there anything else that anyone would like to present with reference to Mr. Banisch?

MR. NOLAN: I would just say, Your Honor, that I will put together an Order for you that will finalize the JOR and I'll circulate it to everybody.

THE COURT: In terms of -- I'm pleased to report that I feel completely comfortable entering a Final Judgment of Compliance in this matter. There were a lot of outstanding issues, little things maybe, but when we had the first day for the Judgment of Compliance I felt that it was better to carry this forward and do a final day, like what we did today.

I want to thank all the participants who worked so hard to take care of all of the outstanding issues. And in terms of the members of the public who came in to listen in, I appreciate the fact that they

are here because this is your town. Mr. Sendell, who is represented by counsel, he's -- I know I always have Fair Share Housing Center who the New Jersey Supreme Court has represented speaks for low and moderate income households, but it's always nice to hear from a member of the public who, quite frankly, isn't complaining that, you know, we shouldn't allow Affordable Housing in the town. Mr. Sendell is an active voice indicating that he wants to insure that the Borough did what it needed to do to provide for low and moderate income housing which is kind of refreshing. I want to thank him for, you know, expressing an interest in participating.

I'm satisfied that all of the necessary notices even above and beyond were provided for today's proceeding. I've been since the Covid Pandemic started, I've been requiring to publish notice of these meetings on their website which isn't something that the Supreme Court ever really talked about or COAH ever talked about, but it seems to be the way that people get information these days, and I want to thank the Borough of Rumson for doing such a great job in terms of keeping the public notified in terms of these proceedings. The obvious fact that it's working is that we have members of the public -- I think it was 22

participants listed in this and even if there's a couple of extras, there were probably about 15 members of the public who were here listening, which I think is nice.

Like we did with the Settlement, I previously handled the first Compliance Hearing who approved a lot of the matters that advocate care.

I find that based upon the evidence presented that the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan and all of the Resolutions and the agreements that the Borough has introduced, everything fulfills the Borough's obligation to provide a realistic opportunity for the creation of Affordable Housing which is the Borough's obligation to provide a reasonable opportunity for the creation of Affordable Housing. The Borough has done everything that it is required to do under the original Order approving the Fairness Hearings (indiscernible) that needed to be done at the prior date of the Compliance Hearings. And having heard from Ms. Lelie and our Special Master, I'm satisfied that all of the outstanding issues have been taken care of, as well. And having fulfilled its obligation, the Borough of Rumson is entitled to a Judgment of Compliance and Repose, a Final Judgment of the conditional that was entered previously, and now a Final Judgment of

Compliance and Repose for the balance of the third round which is through I think July or maybe the beginning of July of 2025 during which time the Borough will be immune from any builder's remedy or Constitutional compliance lawsuits claiming that non-compliance with the Borough's Affordable Housing obligation.

I ask that, Mr. Nolan, if you can prepare a form of Order and the report received Mr. Banisch will be attached to that form of Order.

If there's nothing else, we'll conclude today's proceedings.

I do want to thank everyone for everything you've done. I think you've done a great job for the Affordable Housing Council, for residents of the Borough of Rumson, the Borough, for everyone involved.

Thank you very much. You guys have a great

TRANSCRIBER'S NOTE

night.

This transcript contains "indiscernibles," due to the quality of the audio provided to the transcriber.

CERTIFICATION

I, Geraldine Famularo, the assigned transcriber, do hereby certify the foregoing transcript of proceedings on Courtsmart 5/20/21, index 9:02:12 to 9:57:59 is prepared in full compliance with the current Transcript Format for Judicial Proceedings and is a true and accurate compressed transcript of the proceedings as recorded.

Geraldine Famularo

GERALDINE FAMULARO

#154

AOC NUMBER

Dated: May 23, 2021